



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

material, but still it is there by inference or analogy, greatly weakening the real purpose which it is presumed that the writer had—to tell what message the book has for men and women to-day.

5. **Conclusion.**—It may be thought that this discussion and criticism of Dr. MacLaren's expositions should be followed by some positive and practical suggestions. But this work may be left to the earnest and faithful student of expository preaching. It will not be difficult to estimate the force and bearing of these criticisms. Their outcome should be the raising of questions like these—What is the best method of making an exposition of the Epistle to Philemon? What is the true method of discussing an entire book of the Bible in an expository sermon? More detailed and definite remarks presenting this fruitful subject in other aspects will be presented later.

"YALE RATIONALISM."

One cannot think that Dr. Mendenhall, in *The Christian Advocate* of June 6th, intended to do anyone an injustice. That, however, injustice has been done will appear, I am quite confident, from the following brief statements which I beg to make. I shall refer only to questions raised in that article concerning opinions expressed in the journals of which I am editor.

1. *The citations and quotations made.*—In all some twenty or more cases are cited, from the two journals, which seem to indicate a "rationalistic" (used here in the bad sense) spirit and tendency. Of these three are found in editorials, eight in editorial reviews of books or articles, about twelve in articles by contributors.

(a) So far as concerns the editorials (1) the "higher criticism" was defended; but it was a higher criticism which included the work of such critics as Green and Bissell, not "destructive" criticism; the difference, though ignored by some of our religious editors, is world-wide. (2) Who will deny that it is a mistake to treat as miraculous and supernatural, what, from the very face of the narrative, may be explained in a natural way? (3) It was the magnifying of the divine element to such an extent as to lead to an utter ignoring of the human element that was counted an error.

(b) In the case of reviews, it is only fair to say (1) that the book known as *The Inspired Word* was criticized not because it defended the "plenary inspiration of the Scriptures" (the statement to this effect, as well as some others, being really a misrepresentation), but because it contained certain papers (one in particular, which argued the divine inspiration of the Hebrew vowel-points) which by those who maintain plenary inspiration are regarded as absurdly unscientific and unreliable. (2) Certainly one ought not to be taken too severely to task for saying that an article published in the *Reformed Quarterly Review*, that most staid and careful of all Reviews, "was worthy of careful consideration." (3) One may speak of Genesis as a compilation, as was done in the notice of Deane's *Abraham*, without thereby departing from the views of even the most conservative, for Genesis, though Mosaic, is a compilation; (4) The words "the very boldness and progressiveness of the later criticism lay it open to assault" were intended to criticize the later criticism, rather than anything else; (5) Surely the commendation of Wellhausen's *History of Israel* only to "such as were well established in the faith" was a warning to those who were not well established to let it alone. In

every case, the statements criticized by Dr. Mendenhall, if read in the context, and not twisted to mean something which was not intended by the writer, will be found to be consistent with even the most rigid views of inspiration.

(c) Of the contributed articles with which fault is found, the first is by Mr. (not Prof.) Chancellor, of Amherst College, written under the supervision of Prof. Burroughs, the college pastor, edited and forwarded by him for publication. Another is by Mr. (not Dr.) Reynolds, formerly of New Haven, now sent as Special Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. to France, one of the foremost College Christian workers in New England; his article was merely the presentation of Piepenbring's views, and indicated most clearly, as the quotation shows, the estimate placed upon those views, viz., that they were those of a "skeptical rationalist." A third was by Professor Charles Rufus Brown, Ph.D., of Newton Theological Institution, the oldest and best known of Baptist theological seminaries, in which he mildly characterizes a work on Inspiration as unsatisfactory in that it does not seem to cover all the facts. A fourth by Professor Stevens of Yale Divinity School was one of three, in which three views of the relation of the New Testament to the Old were considered; and the article by Rev. E. Atkinson on the religious ideas of Amos was ably criticized by a New York clergyman in the succeeding number of the *STUDENT* and the criticism published as an editorial. The article by Professor McCurdy, if intelligently read, can be found to contain nothing with which anyone could disagree.

(d) Concerning the material cited from *Hebraica*, it should be noted (1) that the first and second citations, were sentences occurring in book-reviews (by Professor Henry P. Smith, Lane Seminary, Cincinnati), quoted from the author of the book in order to show *his* positions and not those of the writer of the review; (2) that the only remaining matter cited from *Hebraica* had to do with the "Pentateuchal Discussion" which was undertaken by Professor Green and myself for the single purpose of getting the points at issue before the ministers who were able to make use of Hebrew, in such a manner as to enable them to decide the question for themselves. In this discussion, as Dr. Mendenhall kindly suggests, I have undertaken simply to be the spokesman of the analysts. Space will not permit an enlargement of this point.

2. If it were possible, page after page of editorial matter might be quoted from every one of the eight volumes of the *STUDENT* in which the spirit indicated is at the farthest remove from that of destructive rationalism. In ninety issues (of *STUDENT* and *Hebraica*) nearly 4000 pages, it has been possible by close examination and by wresting the meaning to find twenty or so points for criticism. In the search for matter, did Dr. Mendenhall see the following (Vol. II, p. 281), in reference to the results of what he calls "higher criticism": "There is no external evidence for it (the results), while it may be said emphatically that there is external evidence against it. . . . 'Internal criticism is proverbially unreliable when without all external corroboration.'" He might have read in Vol. IV, pp. 36, 37, an editorial on "The minute accuracy of the Old Testament"; and another (pp. 134, 135) on "Questions of Criticism; how and by whom shall they be settled," to which, I am sure, he could not have taken exception; and besides these, many more.

3. The whole question is one of editorial policy, not of editorial opinion. The policy announced in the first number of the journal has been rigidly followed. It has been published on every title page that contributors alone are responsible for their utterances. Nor has the policy been different from that pursued by the editor of the *Methodist Review*, who will remember that within six months he has

requested of the editor of the *STUDENT* an article on the Higher Criticism, a request accompanied by the statement that he was not particular about having the old views presented, or words to that effect. *The Christian Advocate* itself is surely reprehensible for publishing (p. 361) on the page following Dr. Mendenhall's article so warm and commendatory a notice of Prof. Cheyne and his recent work on *Jeremiah*, a book which contains ten times as much "rationalism" (from Dr. Mendenhall's point of view) as can be found in the 4000 pages of the *STUDENT* and *Hebraica*. It was a work of this same author, "Hallowing of Criticism" advocating Biblical criticism, which Dr. Mendenhall condemns in his article. Shall the editor of a scientific journal (not a Sunday-school magazine) limit the contents of his journal to what he himself supposes to be absolutely true? Shall he allow no opportunity for discussion, or for the presentation of the views of others? What shall we say of institutions, such as Newton, Toronto, Amherst, Lane, and others, in which professors teach the publication of whose articles makes the place of the publication the "chief headquarters of American Rationalism?"

4. In conclusion, may he, with all modesty, suggest that the charge of rationalism (in the sense used), the charge of making "the most astounding attacks, sometimes in disguised forms, but usually as brazen as they are dangerous," all this dating, as is asserted, from 1883 (see p. 360, of *The Christian Advocate*, at foot of first column), is hardly borne out in view of all the facts in the case. These "astounding and brazen attacks" are not to be found in the journals, as has been shown. Where have they been made? In one of the forty sessions of the summer schools in which the writer has taught during the past eight years? In the lessons given by correspondence, which have been taken by more than a thousand ministers and teachers? In the Sunday School Studies written for the *Baptist Teacher*? In the Inductive Bible Studies prepared for *The Golden Rule*? In the Bible lectures given at Mr. Moody's School at Northfield, or at Vassar College, or at the Crozer Theological Seminary, or before Bible classes in various places? In the instruction given in the Chautauqua School of the English Bible?

With trained men, in the Theological Seminary at Morgan Park, and in the Philosophical and Theological departments of Yale University, the questions which sustain so vital a relation to our religion, questions of which the very air is full, have been taken up and discussed; the discussion has been careful, and, above all, reverent. Difficulties have been removed and in not a few cases, men who before could not see their way to do so have been led to take up the work of the gospel ministry. An effort has been made to find the truth on some of these points. It may never have been found; but we may well believe that God is pleased with an effort.

When converted to a belief in the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ (a conversion *after* school and college life) the writer pledged himself to the work of Bible study and Bible teaching. He has done what he could to build up not only an interest in the study of the Scriptures, but a faith in their divine origin. The whole purpose of his work has been to teach and establish this point. Just what inspiration is, and just how the doctrine may best be presented or explained is something in reference to which our ablest theologians hold different views. That there is such a thing, that, in other words, the Scriptures are of divine origin, the writer *has* argued and taught, and will argue and teach. If his efforts in this direction, guided as he believes all efforts after and in behalf of truth are guided, have been misunderstood, the responsibility for the misunderstanding must rest outside of himself.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.